



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,156	07/31/2003	Ronald P. Doyle	RSW920030063US1	1905
43168 7590 06/04/2007 MARCIA L. DOUBET LAW FIRM PO BOX 422859 KISSIMMEE, FL 34742			EXAMINER WYSZYNSKI, AUBREY H	
			ART UNIT 2134	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/04/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/632,156

Applicant(s)

DOYLE ET AL.

Examiner

Aubrey H. Wyszynski

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The response of 3/15/07 was received and considered.
2. Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 15-17 and 19-20 have been amended.
3. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-13 and 15-26 are pending.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-13 and 15-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-13 and 15-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bourne et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No.

2004/0168073.

Regarding Claim 1, Bourne discloses a security container (fig. 7, #310) that secures a document component by encapsulating, within the security container, an encrypted version of the document component, an encrypted version of conditional logic for controlling operations on the document component, and key distribution information usable for controlling access to the document component, wherein:

the encrypted version of the document component/content, and the encrypted version of the conditional logic/rights data, are both encrypted using a first key/content key CK, (fig. 7, #304 and #310);

the key distribution information comprises at least one key element; and each key element comprises (i) an identification of a user, a user group, a process, or a process group that is authorized to access the document component; and (ii) an encrypted version of the first key, wherein the encrypted version of the first key/CK is encrypted using a second key/Public key PU-DRM (fig. 7, "(PU-DRM(CK))") that is usable by the identified user, user group, process, or process group for decrypting the encrypted version of the first key, thereby enabling that user, user group, process, or process group to obtain the first key and use it for decrypting the document component and the conditional logic.

Regarding Claim 2, Bourne discloses the security container according to Claim 1, wherein the security container secures a portion of a higher-level document/ signed rights label SRL (fig. 7, #308).

Regarding Claim 3, Bourne discloses the security container according to Claim 2, wherein the higher-level document has more than one portion secured by security containers (fig. 4A).

Regarding Claim 4, Bourne discloses a method of securing document content using security containers/signed rights label SRL (fig. 4A, #308), comprising the step of encapsulating, within a security container, an encrypted version of a document component, an encrypted version of conditional logic for controlling operations on the document component, and key distribution information usable for controlling access to the document component, wherein:

the encrypted version of the document component/CONTENT INFO, and the encrypted version of the conditional logic/RIGHTSDATA, are both encrypted using a first key/K2 (fig. 4A);

the key distribution information comprises at least one key element; and each key element comprises (i) an identification of a user, a group of users, a process, a group of a processes that is authorized to access the document component; and (ii) an encrypted version of the first key/K2, wherein the encrypted version of the first key/K2, is encrypted using a second key/Public key PU-DRM (fig. 4A, "(PU-DRM(K2))") that is usable by the identified user, user group, process, or process group for decrypting the encrypted version of the first key, thereby enabling that user, group of users, process, or group. of processes to obtain the first key and use it for decrypting the document component and the conditional logic.

Regarding Claim 6, Bourne discloses the method according to Claim 4, wherein the first key/K2, comprises a symmetric key/DES key (fig. 4, #408).

Regarding Claim 7, Bourne discloses the method according to Claim 6, wherein the second key comprises, for each of the key elements, a public key associated with the identified user, process, group of users, or group of processes (fig. 4, #414).

Regarding Claim 9, Bourne discloses the method according to Claim 4, wherein the conditional logic further controls access to the document component ([0075]).

Regarding Claim 10, Bourne discloses the method according to Claim 9, wherein the key distribution information further controls access to the conditional logic ([0075]).

Regarding Claim 12, Bourne discloses the method according to Claim 4, wherein the security container is encoded in structured document format ([104]).

Regarding Claim 13, Bourne discloses the method according to Claim 12, wherein the structured document format is Extensible Markup Language ("XML") format ([104]).

Regarding Claim 15, Bourne discloses the method according to Claim 4, wherein at least one of the key elements identifies a group of users and wherein the users in the

Art Unit: 2134

group are determined dynamically, upon receiving a request to access to the document component (fig. 6A, #606).

Regarding Claim 16, Bourne discloses the method according to Claim 15, wherein the dynamic determination further comprises accessing a repository where the users in the group are identified (fig. 6A, #610).

Regarding Claim 17, Bourne discloses the method according to Claim 4, further comprising the steps of receiving, from a requester, a request to access the document component; programmatically determining, using the key distribution information, whether the requester is authorized to access the document component by determining whether, in any selected one of the key elements, the requester is the identified user or the identified process or is a member of the identified group of users or the identified group of processes, and if so, performing steps of:

decrypting the encrypted version of the first key from the selected one of the key elements using the second key usable by that requester, thereby obtaining the first key; decrypting the encrypted version of the conditional logic using the first key, thereby obtaining the conditional logic; decrypting the encrypted version of the document component using the first key, thereby obtaining the document component; and programmatically evaluating, using the conditional logic, whether the request can be granted; and, rejecting the request when the programmatically determining step has a negative result ([0085] [0088] and fig 5).

Regarding Claim 18, Bourne discloses the method according to Claim 17, wherein the conditional logic evaluates at least one of: an identity of the requester; a device used by the requester; a context of the requester; a zone of an application used by the requester; a user profile of the requester; and a target destination of the request ([0089]).

Regarding Claim 19, Bourne discloses a computer program product for securing document content using security containers, the computer program product embodied on one or more computer-readable media and comprising:

computer-readable program code for receiving, from a requester, a request to access document content/content package ([0068], and fig. 11, #13), wherein the document content is encapsulated as an encrypted version of a document component/(K2(CK)) (fig. 4, #408) within a security container/signed rights label SRL (fig. 4A, #308), along with an encrypted version of conditional logic/rights data (K2(rightsdata)) (fig. 4, #416), for controlling operations on the document component and key distribution information usable for controlling access to the document component, wherein:

the encrypted version of the document component and the encrypted version of the conditional logic are both encrypted using a first key/K2;

the key distribution information comprises at least one key element; and each key element comprises (i) an identification of a user, a group of users, a process, or group of processes that is authorized to access the document component; and (ii) an

Art Unit: 2134

encrypted version of the first key/K2, wherein the encrypted version of the first key/K2 is encrypted using a second key/public key PU-DRM (fig. 4, #404) that is usable by the identified user, user group, process, or process group for decrypting the encrypted version of the first key, thereby enabling that user, group of users, process, or groups of processes to obtain the first key and use it for decrypting the document component and the conditional logic;

computer-readable program code for programmatically determining, using the key distribution information, whether the requester is authorized to access the document component by determining whether, in any selected one of the key elements, the requester is the identified user or the identified process or is a member of the identified group of users or of the identified group of processes, and if so, performing steps of: decrypting the encrypted version of the first key from the selected one of the key elements using the second key usable by that requester, thereby obtaining the first key; decrypting the encrypted version of the conditional logic using the first key, thereby obtaining the conditional logic;

decrypting the encrypted version of the document component using the first key, thereby obtaining the document component; and
programmatically evaluating, using the conditional logic, whether the request can be granted; and,

computer-readable program code for rejecting the request when operation of the computer-readable program code for programmatically determining yields a negative result (¶[0085] [0088] and fig 5).

Regarding Claim 20, Bourne discloses a system for securing document content using security containers, comprising:

a security container/signed rights label SRL (fig. 4A, #308), that encapsulates an encrypted version of a document component/content (fig. 4, #408), an encrypted version of conditional logic/rights data (fig. 3, #416) for controlling operations on the document component, an key distribution information (fig. 4, #420) usable for controlling access to the document component, wherein:

the encrypted version of the document component and the encrypted version of the conditional logic are both encrypted using a first key/K2;

the key distribution information comprises at least one key element; and each key element comprises (i) an identification of a user, a group of users, a process, or group of a processes that is authorized to access the document component; and (ii) a encrypted version of the first key/K2, wherein the encrypted version of the first key/K2 is encrypted using a second key/public key PU-DRM, that is usable by the identified user, user group, process, or process group for decrypting the encrypted version of the first key, thereby enabling that user, group of users, process, or groups of processes to obtain the first key and use it for decrypting the document component and the conditional logic;

means for receiving, from a requester, a request to access the document component;

means for programmatically determining, using the key distribution information, whether the requester is authorized to access the document component by determining whether,

Art Unit: 2134

in any selected one of the key elements, the requester is the identified user or the identified process or is a member of the identified group of users or of the identified group of processes, and if so, performing steps of:

decrypting the encrypted version of the first key from the selected one of the key elements using the second key usable by that requester, thereby obtaining the first key;

decrypting the encrypted version of the conditional logic using the first key, thereby obtaining the conditional logic;

decrypting the encrypted version of the document component using the first key thereby obtaining the document component; and

programmatically evaluating, using the conditional logic, whether the request can be granted; and,

means for rejecting the request when operation of the means for programmatically determining yields a negative result (¶[0085] [0088] and fig 5).

Regarding Claim 21, Bourne discloses the system according to Claim 20, wherein the security container is embedded within a document (¶[0084]).

Regarding Claim 22, Bourne discloses the system according to Claim 20, wherein the security container encapsulates the document component on a system clipboard (¶[0075]).

Regarding Claim 23, Bourne discloses the system according to Claim 20, wherein the security container is place on a user interface (fig. 1, #160).

Regarding Claim 24, Bourne discloses the system according to Claim 20, wherein the security container encapsulates the document component for exchange using interprocess communications (§[0051]).

Regarding Claim 25, Bourne discloses the system according to Claim 20, wherein the security container encapsulates the document component for exchange using a messaging system (§[0051])

Regarding Claim 26, Bourne discloses the system according to Claim 20, further comprising means for copying the document component to a target destination, wherein the means for copying copies the entire security container in order to copy the document component (§[0076]).

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aubrey H. Wyszynski whose telephone number is (571)272-8155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, and alternate Friday's.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on 571-272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



KAMBIZ ZAND
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

AHW